

The Sense of Rational/Irrational Reversed:
What Is the Sound Basis for Science?
How Unification Thought Helps Science out of Its Dead End

Hisayoshi Watanabe, Japan

Does the Study of Nature Have no Need for the Supernatural?

Probably the most serious fundamental problem that faces the world's scientists and philosophers today is whether or not you recognize 'intelligence' behind the natural world, the problem that separates them into two camps seemingly irreconcilable. This shows that a deep-rooted assumption of science is now beginning to be called in question. Modern science is supposed to be founded on materialism or atheism, but for the last decade or so, there has been a persistent challenge to the old paradigm and a growing tendency to allow some theistic paradigm as better suited for accounting for new scientific data.

The animosity of the conservative camp toward the dissenters is understandable even in light of my own experience who spent my academically formative years in the latter half of the 20th century, when materialism was rampant and taken for granted as the very soul of academic disciplines, and I as well as others blindly accepted the philosophy without the least bit doubt. It was only late in the last century that I began to suspect that the theistic paradigm for science should not be ruled out a priori. Gradually I grew more convinced that it might be not only permissible but a superior paradigm for scientific pursuits.

My conviction was even more reinforced as I became acquainted with Intelligent Design (ID) theory and as I further grew aware of its strong relevance to Unification Thought (UT).

In this essay I attempt an analytical account of the recent movement in scientific thought which seems to be slowly shifting, though underground, from the atheistic to theistic assumption. Finally, citing a specific problem, I suggest that science should refer to Unification Thought, in order to break through the dead end in which it has driven itself, to better deal with its conundrums, and to rebuild the whole scientific scheme on a sounder, really rational foundation.

A few years ago, NCSE (National Center for Scientific Education) chief Ms. Eugenie Scott, a famous fighter against ID, was heard saying on a You-Tube: "Is it not ridiculous to invoke the

supernatural in studying the natural world?" Is her comment acceptable? This essay may be considered a response to this comment.

The concept 'supernatural' is brought to attention by the poet T. S. Eliot in his essay "Second Thoughts about Humanism," as being slyly made use of by the 'humanist'—rejected in contempt and yet relied on:

My objection is that the humanist makes use, in his separation of the 'human' from the 'natural', of that 'supernatural' which he denies. For I am convinced that if this 'supernatural' is suppressed, the *dualism* of man and nature collapses at once. Man is man because he can recognize supernatural realities, not because he can invent them. Either everything in man can be traced as a development from below, or something must come from above. There is no avoiding that dilemma: you must be either a naturalist or a supernaturalist.¹

Such an Eliotian idea of the 'supernatural' was driven to obscurity as the Darwinian materialism became dominant in the latter half of the 20th century, but it never died out. The idea of human reason, too, as coming "from above" was alive, but it was expelled as a superstition. In an age such as ours when materialistic rationalism was predominant, the 'supernatural' was likewise treated as something dubious, and we were all educated under such a notion. So the sensation we have at the word 'supernatural', which otherwise is a respectable word, is something close to 'weird', 'bizarre', 'ghostly'.

If, for the reason that the concept 'supernatural' implies something like scientific ignorance or the irrational, we entirely reject it, then we will be throwing away the baby with the bathwater. The tragedy of our age is that we are unable to discriminate between them.

In this connection, Mori Ougai's short story "The Snake" may be of relevant interest. In an old countryside house lives a mad woman with her family, and a snake always sits in convulsion in the family Buddhist altar where her recently deceased mother-in-law's name tablet is enshrined. It is said the snake comes back to the old place every time they throw it away. A scientist with a doctor's degree happens to come and stay one night at this house. He is told the story and asked for advice. He simply says "There is nothing mysterious in it," and encloses the snake in a basket and throws it away.

This story is apparently meant for what is called the Enlightenment, which was the spirit of the late Meiji Era of Japan. To say "there is nothing mysterious" from the height of scientific authority

before an unexplained phenomenon and dismiss it decisively will be a pretty glorious act for the scientist to “enlighten” people at least for the moment. But no one can explain it away on the authority of science. Weirdness doesn’t go away: we are not convinced.

After a hundred years after this short story was written, scientists as ever are supposed and encouraged to behave in exactly the same manner. Did this scientist behave rightly *as a scientist*? Rather than guaranteeing there is no mystery and only ignorance, he might as well have said, “There may be some hidden meaning here, but I am not competent to clarify or guess it.”

By the ‘supernatural’ I do not mean only such a case. I mean the mystery or wisdom surpassing human understanding beyond or behind the phenomenal world, *possibly* including such a ‘snake’ mystery. This particular mystery told by Ougai *might have been* explained “scientifically” after applying proper investigation. The problem is that scientists—the entire scientific community—have claimed that they can “rationally” explain *everything* of this world by their materialist-positivist philosophy. And among this ‘everything’ are included such enigmatic problems as the cosmic origin, life’s origin, and human existence. This is an attitude that can be called ‘arrogant’ or ‘dogmatic’.

For instance, mind (consciousness) or life is a phenomenon occurring in this natural world, but is it rational to explain it as purely a natural (physico-chemical) phenomenon without recourse to anything beyond this world? To argue, in treating an overwhelming mystery called life, that all of it—its origin, its history, its incredible complexity—can be explained by a simple principle called (neo-)Darwinism, is not only arrogant but clearly a departure from science as it should be.

If, instead of remaining a modest hypothesis for finding the truth, a theory like Darwinism asserts itself so much as to claim to be almighty—oddly, with no evidence to speak of—and even becomes a means to conquer the world, as is evident in Leonard Susskind’s cosmology, it is no longer science but science turned upside down, an instrument to teach nature how she should be.

Recently, however, a countertrend has arisen within the scientific community to restore science to its original status. In Britain recently, The Center for Intelligent Design started in keeping with the ID movement around the world. In its founders’ statement we read the following:

Intelligent Design (ID) theory argues that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by intelligent causation. As the scientific case for ID has become increasingly visible around the world, it deserves a voice in Britain.

The Center brings ID back to its roots, which are deeply embedded in the history of science in the UK and in Europe. Some of the best known pioneers of modern science did their work in Britain and Europe in the conviction that they were exploring a universe that really was designed.

Though we are inoculated with the idea of ‘modern rationalism’ as if it was a notion guaranteed by science, an approach to the universe cannot be called ‘rational’ if its meaning, value, and purpose are left out as superfluous to science. In this respect, the medieval scholasticism was more ‘rational’ than the modern science. Such was the idea of the philosopher A. N. Whitehead in his *Science and the Modern World* (1926):

If we confine ourselves to certain types of facts, abstracted from the complete circumstances in which they occur, the materialistic assumption expresses these facts to perfection. But when we pass beyond the abstraction, either by more subtle employment of our senses, or by the request for meanings and for coherence of thoughts, the scheme breaks down at once. The narrow efficiency of the scheme was the very cause of its supreme methodological success. For it directed attention to just those groups of facts which, in the state of knowledge then existing, required investigation.

The success of the scheme has adversely affected the various currents of European thought. The historical revolt was *anti-rationalistic*, because the *rationalism of the scholastic* required a sharp correction by contact with brute fact.²

(italics mine)

The problem of modern science here pointed out that its partial success was the cause of its blindness to the whole, has been carried on unquestioned to this day, and only recently surfaced to the general notice. The illusion that materialistic science is science as it should be has dominated us so long, but ironically the very fruits of that materialistic science are now working to weaken the premise of materialism.

The late British philosopher Antony Flew, who used to be valued as a pillar of atheism, recently declared to discard atheism and side with ID, because the recent findings of biology such as the digital codes within the cell and its incredible complexity allow no room for atheism, and that one must “follow the evidence wherever it leads.”

I have looked at the current paradigm war (or science revolution) in terms of the reversed sense of rational/irrational. This can also be seen as the reversed sense of sound/unsound. What do you call

‘sound’, and what ‘unsound’? What do you call ‘rational’, what ‘irrational’? As is clearly evidenced in the recent battles over ID, for atheists to blindly keep faithful to their cause by vilely attacking the ID proponents, is a mark of the unsound mind, almost pathological.

Clearly, atheists cannot distinguish between ‘supernatural’ and ‘spooky’, between ‘mystic’ and ‘eerie’. Awe or mystic feeling before the Wisdom surpassing us is a mark of the healthy mind. About the same time as Whitehead’s *Science and the Modern World*, the famous scientist Sir Arthur Eddington wrote in his *Nature of the Physical World* (1928):

We all know that there are regions of the human spirit untrammelled by the world of physics. In the *mystic sense* of the creation around us, in the expression of art, in a yearning towards God, the soul grows upward and finds the fulfillment of something implanted in its nature. The sanction for this development is within us, a striving born with our consciousness or an Inner Light proceeding from a greater power than ours. Science can scarcely question this sanction, for the pursuit of science springs from a striving which the mind is impelled to follow, a questioning that will not be suppressed. Whether in the intellectual pursuits of science or in the *mystical pursuits* of the spirit, the light beckons ahead and the purpose surging in our nature responds.³ (italics mine)

This is saying that our mind is designed by the divine wisdom so as to pursue and recognize the created world, and that this fact itself cannot be the object of scientific pursuit. What is preached here is close to what Unification Thought (especially its theory of epistemology) expounds and also to ID philosophy (especially Wiker and Witt’s *A Meaningful World*). If someone should find here something anti-scientific or superstitious, that person would surely be suffering from the malady of the age called materialism.

Is the Multiverse Hypothesis Sane or Insane?

The famous cosmologist Stephen Hawking recently published a (co-authored) book called *The Grand Design*, in which he argues that for the creation of the universe God is unnecessary, because physical laws are sufficient for the task. This has been applauded by pro-atheist media and sympathetic people. What surprised the world is that Hawking was thought to be rather theistic. (Paul Davies took the title for his book *The Mind of God* from a sentence of Hawking.)

The Washington Times of October 1, 2010 published a review of this book written by scientist and

mathematician Bruce L. Gordon with this cynically witty title: “Hawking irrational argument: Theoretical physicist takes leave of his senses” (hawk=sell, spread, take leave of one’s senses=go mad). Here is the first part:

Mr. Hawking asserts that “as recent advances in cosmology suggest, the laws of gravity and quantum theory allow universes to appear spontaneously from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist. It is not necessary to invoke God to light the blue touch paper and set the universe going.” But “spontaneous creation” minus any cause illustrates the lack of an explanation rather than scientific comprehension. It also runs counter to a question Mr. Hawking voiced years ago: “What is it that breathes fire into the equations and make a universe for them to describe?”

Mr. Hawking should take a cue from his earlier self. His question notes the difference between mere mathematical descriptions and genuine explanations. Mathematical descriptions tell us what mathematical relationships hold among phenomena but not why they hold. Genuine explanations tell us how things actually work—that is, why such descriptions apply and are effective. Quantum theory applied to gravitation and cosmology allows mathematical descriptions of highly speculative conjectures that, even if taken seriously, provide no explanation of the events they conjure. Aside from the dearth of evidence lending credence to these speculations, their explanatory impotence is inherited from ordinary quantum mechanics, which describes measurable phenomena with great accuracy but provides no understanding of why particular quantum outcomes are observed. ...The physical universe is causally incomplete and therefore neither self-originating nor self-sustaining. The world of space, time, matter and energy is dependent on a reality that transcends space, time, matter and energy.

There is no knowing why Hawking changed, or if he really changed, his mind, but as the title of this review suggests, his book may symbolize the present-day uncertainty as to the standard of sane/insane, rational/irrational. One is reminded of the father of ID movement Phillip Johnson’s book *Reason in the Balance*. Remember my quote from Ms. Scott: “Is it not ridiculous to invoke the supernatural in studying the natural world?” The same review concludes:

The multiverse hypothesis is therefore falsified because it renders false what we know to be true about ourselves. Clearly, embracing the multiverse idea entails a nihilistic irrationality that destroys the very possibility of science.

Universes do not “spontaneously create” on the basis of abstract mathematical descriptions, nor

does the fantasy of a limitless multiverse trump the explanatory power of transcendent intelligent design. What Mr. Hawking's contrary assertions show is that mathematical savants can sometimes be metaphysical simpletons. Caveat emptor.

The multiverse hypothesis is a purely speculative device with a view to explaining “rationally”—that is, materialistically rationally, without invoking designing intelligence—why our universe at the beginning was so finely tuned numerically so as to produce higher life like us 13.7 billion years later. It is widely accepted among scientists that the initial conditions of our universe, the numerous physical constants that underlie our universe are so incredibly fine-tuned for life that even the slightest change to one of them would have resulted in no life, or even no universe.

Now, the question arises in everybody's mind: Is it “rational” to invoke a mathematically possible, but purely imaginary, infinite number of random universes, in order to argue that our universe is the result of mindless forces? The multiverse hypothesis is a form of the Darwinian sophistry extended to cosmology that there is no such thing as design: what you call design only *seems* to be design.

For the past few years, books by scientists and philosophers with the word ‘God’ in their titles have appeared successively, indicating the changing mindset of scientists. One such book is Robert Spitzer's *New Proofs for the Existence of God* (2010), in which it is said in the same vein:

The belief that a mathematical description shows that the universe does not have and does not need a cause is both a *non sequitur*—it does not follow from the descriptions themselves—and an ontological category mistake. When landscape theorists like Leonard Susskind assert the existence of a landscape of possibilities giving rise to a megaverse of actualities and suggest that this provides a mindless solution to the problem of fine-tuning, they completely ignore the fact that a virtually unlimited arena of mathematical possibilities *cannot generate even one actual universe*. The mindless multiverse “solution” to the problem of fine-tuning is, quite literally, a metaphysical non-starter. What the absence of efficient material causality in fundamental physics and cosmology reveal instead is the limit of scientific explanation and the need for a deeper understanding.⁴ (*italics original*)

Spitzer maintains that such a theory “seems to contain the seeds for destroying science as a rational enterprise.” The “need for a deeper understanding” implies that we need an entirely different paradigm, not an extended research under the same materialistic paradigm, not a pursuit of the old atheistic rationality which only leads to irrationality, but rationality on the theistic basis. We need a new definition of science—science as a rational belief in the deeper creative Wisdom which is

ready to reveal itself according to the vehemence of our intellectual thirst for it.

The same *Washington Times* reviewer refers to this Wisdom as “a mind that can choose among the infinite variety of mathematical descriptions and bring into existence a reality that corresponds to a consistent subset of them.” Well said, but God is not only a mathematician far surpassing humans but a great artist as well. Our world is evidently created on a principle of beauty which apparently can be shared between the Creator and us, including mathematical beauty and the beauty of functional structures. As Sir Arthur Eddington suggested, the irrepressible thirst residing in artists and scientists must itself be implanted in us by the Creator.

Eugenie Scott’s ridicule can also be refuted from a purely logical standpoint. The natural world—actually anything existing—does not have within itself a reason for its own existence. The reason for the existence of our universe (whether multi or single) is not contained within its own self. There is what is called Goedel’s theorem (named after the mathematician Kurt Goedel) which states: a theoretical system cannot have within itself that which proves its own validity. This can be applied both to the universe and to our individual selves. One does not know why one exists at all. The reason for the human (or cosmic) existence must come from outside or beyond it. Even if the human existence is meaningless as atheists say, there must be some reason for its meaninglessness. But once it is accepted as meaningful, there must be a meaning to each of us, not only to the human species as a whole. Unification Thought conceptualizes it as Individual Truth Being.

It is only when we have adopted a theistic paradigm of science that we begin to be able to ‘explain’ this world and things in it. This theistic paradigm should not be mistaken, as is willfully and deridingly done by Darwinists, for ‘God-of-the-gaps’, that is, introducing God into science to gloss over ignorance. Such derision comes from their rigid notion of science as synonymous to materialism. It ironically reveals the limitation of their imagination: *they cannot think of God as other than a factor or an element*. The fact is that our universe can only be explained rationally as dependent on a greater Wisdom than ours.

From the fact of the improbable ‘anthropic’ fine-tuning of our universe, from the cell with the genetic digital code which Richard Dawkins said “is uncannily computer-like,” from the paleontological fact of species’ stability and discontinuity as shown in the fossil record, and above all, from the purposeful design we perceive in the evidence of natural objects, we cannot but assume some designing agent, some “supernatural” creative power behind the natural world. The merit of this assumption is not only that it works more ‘heuristically’—as a guide to scientific discoveries—but also that it reveals coherent interrelations among hitherto unconnected realms of

mental activity—for instance, between science and ethics and between science and art. To understand is not merely to dissect: it is to find relationships between things.

How Unification Thought can Help Biology That Has Reached a Dead End

Unification Thought provides for these considerations a firm foundation. It is a system of thought that provides, from the point of view of Divine creation, an organically unified perspective to all areas of our mental activity. What follows is a supplement to the discussion of Unification Thought in the book I co-authored with Tadashi Harada, *The 150 Years' Dissemblance of Darwinism: the Fall of Materialist Culture and the Advancing ID Science Revolution* (2009).

If the old rationalism is no longer rational, we have to look for another rationalism that accommodates new scientific data and meets our changing worldview. Since Darwinists adhere to materialist rationalism, they are convinced that biological species changed gradually into other species, never admitting the possibility of their appearing in full forms more or less abruptly. But the fossil record shows no sign of gradual change of any organism, and even in thought experiments it is difficult to imagine, say, the gradual appearance of wings on birds, or the natural transformation of fish into amphibian. But how, then, do we explain the origin of the first life or of subsequent species?

Now, before going to Unification Thought, we must prepare ourselves by laying aside our habitual materialistic thinking. Unification Thought requires us to accept the pre-existence of Mind as the source of everything. While in ID theory the pre-existence of Mind (intelligence) is only inferred, Unification Thought starts with it as *fait accompli*. That is to say, it is essential to accept the fact of mind/ life existing prior to the physical world. Since this is confirmed by our everyday experience—we all know mind/ life exists in itself, though invisible—it would seem to be easier to admit it than to admit the existence of God. But to some materialistically rigid minds it seems to be very hard to think that way. Anyway, “bracketing” our habit of thought is required here.

Scientist Robert Lanza's recent book *Biocentrism: How Life and Consciousness Are the Keys to Understanding the True Nature of the Universe* (2009) begins with these sentences:

Our understanding of the universe as a whole has come to a dead end. The “meaning” of quantum physics has been debated since it was discovered in the 1930s, but we are no closer to understanding it now than we were then. The “theory of everything” that was promised for

decades to be just around the corner has been stuck for decades in the abstract mathematics of string theory, with its unproven and unprovable assertions.

...This book proposes a new perspective: that our current theories of the physical world don't work, and can never be made to work, until they account for life and consciousness. This book proposes that, rather than a belated and minor outcome after billions of years of lifeless physical processes, life and consciousness are absolutely fundamental to our understanding of the universe. We call this new perspective biocentrism.⁵

And referring to the cosmic fine-tuning enigma:

With biocentrism, the mystery of the Goldilocks⁶ universe goes away, and *the critical role of life and consciousness in shaping the universe becomes clear.*

So you either have an astonishingly improbable coincidence revolving around the indisputable fact that the cosmos could have any properties but happens to have exactly the right ones for life, or else you have exactly what must be seen if indeed the cosmos is biocentric. Either way, the notion of a random billiard-ball cosmos that could have had any forces that boast any range of values, but instead has the *weirdly* specific ones needed for life, looks impossible enough to seem downright silly.⁷ (italics mine)

To feel the fact of cosmic fine-tuning “weird” as one feels Mori Ougai’s snake story weird is a hallmark of incorrigible atheists, of whom there are many in our age of deranged sensibility. (Cf. Dawkins: “uncannily computer-like”) Theistic scientists, on the hand, will have such a *robust* feeling of awe or mystery as Sir Arthur Eddington would have had before this revelation. The fact of cosmic fine-tuning is a ‘given’ not for the scientist to explain, but for the philosopher to interpret.

Modern scientists, though as yet a minority, are reaching this kind of awareness: that our universe can better be understood as an organically unified entity rather than as an inanimate expanse harboring life in it—rather as a life field or a matrix—and that combined evidence from cosmology, biology (information in the cell, irreducible complexity, etc.) and paleontology (discontinuous fossil record) points to some designing agent, or “super-intellect” as the astronomer Fred Hoyle put it.

With these preliminaries I would like to see what suggestions Unification Thought (UT) offers to the problem of ‘evolution’, one of the most difficult of scientific difficulties. First of all, since UT begins with the exposition of Divine Character, the premise of the existence of mind

(consciousness) prior to all is a shared supposition between the most avant-garde science and UT—“the critical role of life and consciousness in shaping the universe”.

It is easy to point out the weaknesses or impossibility of Darwinism. But what alternative explanation can there be? Divine creation or Divine causation *may* now be almost accepted as fact. But how was it effected? For the present, we have such a book as ID proponent Stephen Meyer’s *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (2009), which has shown that the highly complex system of digital information found in the cell cannot be ascribed to mindless causation: it can only come from an intelligent source. At present, however, it will be impossible to go any further even for scientists who have thrown away materialism.

The universal framework that UT proposes for understanding the structure of the physical-metaphysical world has in it some hints to solve this problem. It is made possible by the vision of UT that captures the process of ‘creation’ and ‘epistemology’ (how is cognition possible?) in the same perspective—two things usually thought unrelated.

I would like to explain the scheme so as to convey the idea even to those who are not initiated in UT, but I must needs make a quotation from *New Essentials of Unification Thought: Head-Wing Thought* (2006), Chapter 9 ‘Epistemology,’ though some of the terminology will be unfamiliar:

...Cognition is basically the process of collating and uniting, through give and receive action, the “content and form” of the subject and the “content and form” of the object. When that happens, an identity-maintaining four position foundation is formed. On the other hand, a developmental four position foundation is formed in the case of the human activity of dominion.

Cognition is closely associated with dominion. There is no dominion without cognition, and there is no cognition without dominion. Cognition and dominion form reciprocal circuits of give and receive action between human beings and all things. That is to say, the process of cognition is one circuit (from the object to the subject), and the process of dominion is the other circuit (from the subject to the object). Then, let us examine the relationship between the developmental four position foundation in cognition. Dominion here refers to the exercise of one’s creativity; therefore, the four position foundation in dominion is the same as the four position foundation in creation.

As explained in the Theory of the Original Image, God created all things through the two stages of creation, namely, the formation of the inner developmental four position foundation (i.e., the formation of Logos) and the formation of the outer developmental four position

foundation. In this sequential process, first, the inner developmental four position foundation was formed, and then the outer developmental four position foundation was formed. Thus, all things were created in sequence, “from the inner to the outer four position foundations.” In contrast, in the formation of the identity-maintaining four position foundation for cognition, first, the outer identity-maintaining four position foundation is formed, and then the inner identity-maintaining four position foundation is formed. Thus, cognition takes place in sequence, “from the outer to the inner four position foundations.”

Hence, cognition is accomplished as the result of the formation of the inner identity-maintaining four position foundation, whereby the external element and the internal element are collated.⁸ (underlines mine)

Questions may arise why this should be written in such a difficult manner, even using some unheard-of terms, and why diagrams are not used. Diagrams *are* used in plenty, but I omit them here to avoid further complication. As for the first question, such a style and terminology are inevitable, first, for the almost mathematical precision this system of philosophy demands, and second, for coherence of all chapters (themes) united by a set of several technical concepts. The reader is expected to read this book from the first page on. (To make a start at exegesis, “four position foundation” is the visualized form of “give and receive action” which is the causative mechanism of all things that exist as well as develop themselves. “Inner” means ‘more metaphysical or immaterial,’ while “outer” means ‘more physical or material.’)

Setting further details aside, I think this passage (notably the underlined parts) contains hints for the mystery of mysteries: the abrupt appearance of biological species in their full forms, as represented by the ‘Cambrian explosion,’ without any precursors leading to them.

There are several points that constitute such hints. First, although this is an excerpt from the chapter dealing with epistemology, there is allusion to God’s creation (the “two stages of creation” and the “formation of Logos”). This means creation and cognition (process of knowing) are captured in one perspective. Second, UT epistemology is a theory of “collation,” (which is different both from the Kantian epistemology loosely described as “active construction,” and from the Marxian epistemology described as “passive reflection.”) Third, our cognition and the Divine creation are two (reversed) aspects of one process, the former proceeding from the outer world (through our senses) to the world of inner plan or Logos (‘reverse engineering,’ as it were), and the latter proceeding from inner plan (the first stage of creation) to the actual created world.

To say that the UT theory of epistemology is a theory of “collation” (identifying) means that we

have both “form and content” implanted in us to identify the “form and content” of the created world. We are designed so as to recognize what was designed to be recognized by us. What we already know without knowing that we know it is called an “a priori prototype” or “original prototype.” This is akin to the Platonic theory of “recollection.” In one of Plato’s Dialogues, *Meno*, such a priori knowledge is shown to be true by demonstrating that a young untaught slave can understand geometry. But there is this difference, that in UT epistemology cognition is made possible through the “give and receive action” between the “form and content” residing in us and the “form and content” residing in the outer world.

On this UT epistemology, it is possible to solve Einstein’s enigma: “The most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that it is comprehensible.” (Eugene Wigner also referred in perceptible awe to the same mystery.) The universe is created ‘anthropic’, namely, with us in mind, so as to be ultimately comprehensible to us.

Now, in our everyday experience we know cognition occurs more or less abruptly: it does not usually occur piecemeal. We recognize a person’s face abruptly as a presentiment coming true, not gradually by adding up its features. This abrupt form of cognition by “collation” seems to apply to a wide range of our experience—from the everyday ‘aha’ cognition to sophisticated scientific discoveries and religious awakenings. Merleau-Ponty in his *Phenomenology of Perception* writes to the same effect, using the example of a person walking the beach trying to identify a far-off object, then suddenly recognizing it as a wreck as he or she approaches it.⁹

If this is true, so far as we are given to understand that the Divine creation and human cognition are in essence the same process—just reversed in direction—the Divine creation proceeding from plan or idea to the actual creation must be like our identifying (or recollecting) something lurking in us—meaning God’s creation was effected as *abruptly* as we identify a thing or “collate” one thing with another.

Thus, UT’s unified comprehension of the world can lend not only credibility but also *rationality*, against the background of cosmic principle, to the supposition that the creation of living things occurred, not in Darwinian fashion, but more or less abruptly, each in its completed form at the appointed time. And this certainly is consistent with the Cambrian explosion, in which most of the major animal body plans abruptly appeared fully formed in a very short space of time.

There are more about UT that can help us solve the mystery of creation, but I will not go into further details here. Anyway, UT lends great cogency to the teleological or ‘anthropic’ worldview

now gaining influence. There is no denying that teleology which has long been a taboo to science must somehow be incorporated in it, as an increasing number of scientists suspect or suggest, and as UT explicitly urges, in order to *more rationally* explain our dear home, the universe.

Notes

1. T. S. Eliot, "Second Thoughts about Humanism," *Selected Essays* (Faber & Faber, 1932), p. 485.
2. A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 22.
3. Sir Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World* (Cambridge University Press, 1928), p. 327-28.
4. Robert J. Spitzer, *New Proofs for the Existence of God* (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Michigan/Cambridge, U. K., 2010), pp. 102-103.
5. Robert Lanza & Bob Berman, *Biocentrism: How Life and Consciousness are the Keys to Understanding the True Nature of the Universe* (Benbella Books, INC., 2010), pp. 1-2.
6. *Goldilocks* is the little girl's name in the British fable "The Three Bears." Because the phrase "just fit" is the motif of the story, it is used for 'fine-tuning.' Cf. Paul Davies, *The Goldilocks Enigma: Why Is the Universe Just Right for Life?* (2006)
7. Robert Lanza & Bob Berman, p. 91.
8. *New Essentials of Unification Thought: Head-Wing Thought* (Unification Thought Institute, 2006), pp. 416-17.
9. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, M・メルロー＝ポンティ 『知覚の現象学』(みすず書房、1967) 25 頁。